



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

[	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
	10/602,730	06/25/2003	Joo-Yul Lee	6161.0063.AA 8848	
	58027 7:	590 04/19/2006		EXAMINER	
	H.C. PARK & 8500 LEESBU	k ASSOCIATES, PLO		SHERMAN, STEPHEN G	
	SUITE 7500			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	VIENNA, VA	22182	_	2629	

DATE MAILED: 04/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/602,730	LEE, JOO-YUL	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Stephen G. Sherman	2629	

	Stepnen G. Snerman	2629							
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	lress						
THE REPLY FILED 10 April 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.									
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or or this application, applicant must timely file one of the follow places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Not a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliant time periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of ving replies: (1) an amendment, af tice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in	Appeal. To avoid aba fidavit, or other evider compliance with 37 C	nce, which FR 41.31; or (3)						
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date									
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire	ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailir	ig date of the final reject	ion.						
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED W TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).									
extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee ave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee nder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as et forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, hay reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).									
<ol> <li>The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any external</li> </ol>	oliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	filed within two mont	hs of the date of ne appeal. Since						
a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed AMENDMENTS									
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,			ecause						
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co		TE below);							
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below			the incurs for						
<ul><li>(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be appeal; and/or</li></ul>	tter form for appeal by materially re	eaucing or simplifying	the issues for						
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally re	jected claims.							
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).									
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1		ompliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).						
<ol><li>Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)</li></ol>									
<ol> <li>Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).</li> </ol>	llowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the						
<ol> <li>For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro</li> </ol>		ill be entered and an	explanation of						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:									
Claim(s) objected to:									
Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:									
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE									
8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	it before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affida	lotice of Appeal will <u>n</u> vit or other evidence i	ot be entered is necessary and						
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar</li> </ol>	overcome all rejections under appe	al and/or appellant fa	ils to provide a						
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER									
The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application i	in condition for allowa	ince because:						
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s).	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper I	No(s)							
13.  Other:									
		AMF PRIMA	A. AWAD						
		1	AMINER						
		אווון זווון	III AV						

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: In the remarks filed the 10 April 2006 the applicant argues that the Yp and Yfr shown in the prior art cannot anticipate the applicant's main path switch because, together, Yp and Yfr are not "coupled between the contact point of the first and second switches and second end of the rising ramp switch," "between the second voltage and the scan electrode," nor "between the contact point of the first and second switches and another end of the rising ramp switch." The examiner respectfully disagrees. The examiner asserts that adding the ground conection to the falling ramp switch as part of the main path switch does not break the invention nor does it go against the claim language. Therefore, the main path switch as formed by the prior art is still coupled "between the contact point of the first and second switches and second end of the rising ramp switch" as is claimed while containing a conection to ground as well, which is allowed by the comprising format of the claims.